

General Plan Update: Issues for Staff Response October 20, November 10 & December 8, 2010

The following are issues raised to the Board of Supervisors where staff has been directed to provide detailed additional information/analysis at a continued hearing scheduled for February 9, 2011:

General Plan Update Density Related Issues

1. Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program – Additional information was requested including research of possible sources of funding and greater detail on program implementation.
2. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program – Additional information was requested on the TDR program that is recommended by the Planning Commission.
3. Williamson Act – Information was requested on the possibility of creating a tailored Williamson Act-type program to assist farmers impacted by the General Plan Update.
4. Fiscal Impacts of Reductions in Density – Staff was requested to respond to criticisms on the Keyser Marston Associates analysis on the General Plan Update effects on County finances and property values.
5. Water – Staff was requested to response to criticism of County-prepared groundwater study and testimony that imported water supplies are not sufficient to support growth and to elaborate on groundwater quality issues.
6. Fire Risk – Staff was requested to provide a more detailed analysis for how fire risk relates to the recommended project.
7. Supplemental Information on Reductions in Density – Additional GIS analysis was requested to identify existing parcels in areas subject to reductions in density.

General Plan Update Content Specific Issues

8. Flexibility in General Plan Update Policies – Additional information was requested related to the flexibility that the County would have under future policies.
9. Future General Plan Amendments (GPAs) – Further explanation was requested of how GPAs will be treated under the General Plan Update.
10. Specific Plan Areas – Staff was requested to provide further information related to the proposal to no longer use the Specific Plan Area land use designation for lands without adopted Specific Plans.
11. Special Study Areas – Staff was asked to elaborate on the use of Special Study Areas in the General Plan Update.

12. Residential Density Determination – Evaluation of revisions to the Policy LU-1.9 was requested to allow for lands within 10-15% of the necessary acreage to subdivide the ability to so do.
13. Fire Response/Travel Standards – Further information was requested on the use of fire response time standards instead of travel time standards which are currently proposed for the General Plan Update.
14. Acceptable Level of Service – Additional information was requested on the proposed policy to accept certain roads with lower level of service (LOS).
15. Road 3A Valley Center – Analysis was requested of possible alternatives to constructing Road 3A in Valley Center.

Future Development and Conservation Related Issues

16. Deference to Community Plans – County staff was requested to respond to concerns raised about proposed general plan policies that reference community plans and/or community character.
17. Conservation Subdivisions Avoidance Requirements – Additional information was requested on the avoidance requirements for environmentally sensitive lands in the Conservation Subdivision Program.
18. Conservation Subdivisions Multi-Family Building Allowance – Consideration was requested for removing a proposed provision from the Planned Residential Development section of the Zoning Ordinance that would allow multi-family building types in single family zones under certain conditions.
19. Conservation Subdivisions Design – Additional information was requested on how poorly designed (“cookie cutter”) developments will be prevented with conservation subdivisions.
20. Groundwater Ordinance Lot Size Reductions – Staff was requested to explore elimination of the Groundwater Ordinance provision that allows for reduction in minimum lot sizes to 66% of that specified in the ordinance in certain circumstances.
21. Alternative Septic Systems – Further information was requested on the feasibility, benefits, and drawbacks of alternative septic systems as well as the ability for the County to accommodate their use.
22. Open Space Lands Maintenance – Additional information was requested concerning the ownership and maintenance of open space lands that are generated as a result of new development projects.

Other Identified Issues

23. Community Planning & Sponsor Group Positions – Staff was requested to clarify the positions of the community planning & sponsor groups with respect to their recommended

land use map, position on the Conservation Subdivision Program, and recommended lot size limitations.

24. Climate Change – Additional information was requested on the relationship of the General Plan Update to SB 375 and other Statewide efforts to address global climate change.
25. Impacts to Unrecorded Maps – Further explanation was requested on the impacts of the General Plan Update on unrecorded subdivision maps that are not consistent with the General Plan Update.
26. Agriculture Preserve Designator – Additional information was requested on the proposal to remove certain properties from agricultural preserves.
27. Mapping Clean-up Process – Staff was requested to identify a near-term/low-cost process after approval of the General Plan Update for individuals to raise additional mapping issues for Board of Supervisors' consideration and to address clean-up issues with the Plan.